UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,638	03/17/2004	Chi-Yang Lin	VIAP0101USA	2637
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506			EXAMINER	
			PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2629		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/708,638	LIN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	JEFF PIZIALI	2629		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 J	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pre			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-16,19 and 20 is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn fro 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-11,13-16,19 and 20 are subjected to a subject of the control of the cont	om consideration.	equirement.		
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ne 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	pate		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10 June 2008 has been entered.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

3. The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the figures.

Specification

4. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Application/Control Number: 10/708,638 Page 3

Art Unit: 2629

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 19, drawn to a display controller, classified in class 345, subclass 501 (e.g., graphic processing systems).
 - II. Claims 11, 13-16, and 20, drawn to a method for calibrating a display driving voltage, classified in class 341, subclass 120 (e.g., methods of data value conversion and calibration).

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h).

Art Unit: 2629

(1) In the instant case, the process for using the product as claimed (the method of claims 11, 13-16, and 20) can be practiced with another materially different product (than the display controller of claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 19).

For example, the process as claimed (the method of claims 11, 13-16, and 20) can be practiced with another materially different product (than the display controller of claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 19) not including at least "a graphics chip for outputting a display data" as claimed in independent claim 1 (line 2); "a converter for converting the display data into a display driving voltage" as claimed in independent claim 1 (line 3); "the output current being delivered to the monitor for generating the display driving voltage" as claimed in independent claim 1 (lines 7-8); and "a plurality of second current routes electrically connected to the first current route for delivering a plurality of mirror currents to an output port of the converter to form the output current" as claimed in independent claim 1 (lines 11-13).

(2) In the instant case, the product as claimed (in claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 19) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (than the method of claims 11, 13-16, and 20).

For example, the product as claimed (in claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, and 19) can be used in a materially different process of using that product (than the method of claims 11, 13-16, and 20) without, "calibrating a display driving voltage," as claimed in independent claim 11 (line 1); "converting a display data into an output current according to a reference current," as claimed

in independent claim 11 (line 3); "the output current is generated from utilizing a current mirror means for delivering the reference current via a first current route and forming the output current through a plurality of mirror currents delivered via a plurality of second current routes," as claimed in independent claim 11 (lines 5-8); and "driving a monitor to display images according to the display driving voltage," as claimed in independent claim 11 (line 16).

- 3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
 - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
 - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
 - (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
 - (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
 - (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include

(i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected

Application/Control Number: 10/708,638

Art Unit: 2629

Page 7

process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 8

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeff Piziali/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2629

28 August 2008